

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Independent claim 1 stands rejected as being anticipated Akhterzzaman et al. Independent claim 14 stands rejected as being anticipated Kang. All other claims are dependent and stand rejected as unpatentable over Akhterzzaman et al. and/or Kang. These rejections are respectfully traversed. Independent claims 1 and 14 and dependent claims 15-23 have been amended.

The present invention facilitates the relocation of a mobile unit to a preferred communication area, such as a "hot spot" in a WLAN. Amended claim 1 defines a method that includes:

displaying the relative position data of said at least one preferred communication area to facilitate relocation of the mobile unit from the determined mobile unit estimated location to said at least one preferred communication area.

Amended claim 14 defines a mobile unit that has:

a user output device configured to display relative position data of said at least one preferred communication area relative to the determined mobile unit estimated location to facilitate relocation of the mobile unit from the determined mobile unit estimated location to said at least one preferred communication area.

As defined by claims 13 and 19, the display may be in the form of a map so that the user can see which direction and how far the mobile unit must be moved from the current location to enter the preferred communication area.

Both Akhterzzaman et al. and Kang only teach displaying to a user of a mobile unit information as to the mobile unit's current location. In Akhterzzaman

Applicant: Reddy et al.
Application No.: 10/675,638

et al., that information advises the mobile user whether the mobile unit is in a restricted area. In Kang, that information alerts the user whether the mobile unit is in a home-zone or a non-home zone.

Akhterzzaman et al. and Kang do not disclose or suggest how a mobile user is to determine where to relocate a mobile unit to a preferred area. Both references merely alert the mobile user of the fact that they are in a preferred area after the mobile unit enters such an area. Neither Akhterzzaman et al. or Kang discloses or suggests displaying relative position data of a preferred communication area to facilitate relocation of the mobile unit from the determined mobile unit estimated location to the preferred communication area as claimed.

Additionally, the examiner cites Kang against claims 13 and 19 as teaching a map display, but this simply is not the case. Kang only teaches displaying words identifying the mobile unit's current location.

Based on the arguments presented above, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-23 is respectfully requested.


If the Examiner believes that any additional minor formal matters need to be addressed in order to place this application in condition for allowance, or that a telephone interview will help to materially advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Applicant: Reddy et al.
Application No.: 10/675,638

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1 - 23, is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Reddy et al.

By 
C. Frederick Koenig III
Registration No. 29,662

Volpe and Koenig, P.C.
United Plaza, Suite 1600
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
Telephone: (215) 568-6400
Facsimile: (215) 568-6499

CFK/djw